



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GREG ABBOTT

June 3, 2003

Ms. Marcelle Sattiewhite Jones  
General Counsel  
North Texas Tollway Authority  
P.O. Box 260729  
Plano, Texas 75026

OR2003-3756

Dear Ms. Jones:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 182436.

The North Texas Tollway Authority (the "NTTA") received a request for the contract, proposals submitted, and information regarding submitted lump sum prices pertaining to the Total Routine Maintenance Contract for the President George Bush Turnpike. You indicate that, with the exception of the bid proposal submitted by Roy Jorgensen Associates, Inc., ("Jorgensen") you have released the requested information to the requestor. You state that release of the proposal submitted by Jorgensen may implicate Jorgensen's the proprietary interests. We note that NTTA does not take a position on the disclosure of the proposal. However, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified Jorgensen of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Act in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address NTTA's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Sections 552.301(a) and (b) provide:

- (a) A governmental body that receives a written request for information that it wishes to withhold from public disclosure and that it considers to be within

one of the [Public Information Act's] exceptions . . . must ask for a decision from the attorney general about whether the information is within that exception if there has not been a previous determination about whether the information falls within one of the exceptions.

(b) The governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within a reasonable time but not later than the tenth business day after the date of receiving the written request.

You indicate that NTTA received this request for information on February 18, 2003. Accordingly, you were required to submit your request for a decision from this office no later than March 4, 2003. We received your request for a decision on April 3, 2003. Consequently, we determine that NTTA failed to request a decision within the ten business day period as mandated by section 552.301(b) of the Government Code.

Under section 552.301(e), a governmental body receiving an open records request for information that it wishes to withhold pursuant to one of the exceptions to public disclosure is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving the request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. The NTTA failed to submit the information required under section 552.301(e) within the fifteen business day deadline.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). A compelling interest can be demonstrated where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Jorgensen has submitted comments arguing that portions of its proposal contain proprietary information.

Jorgensen argues that portions of its proposal should be withheld from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104, however, is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions which are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private

parties submitting information to the government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As NTTA does not raise section 552.104, this section does not apply to the requested information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.104). Therefore, the information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

We note that some of submitted information is protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are protected by copyright. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of materials protected by copyright, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990). We conclude that NTTA must release the submitted proposal to the requestor in compliance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



David R. Saldivar  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DRS/seg

Ref: ID# 182436

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Matthew Pures  
DeAngelo Brothers, Inc.  
100 North Conahan Drive  
Hazleton, Pennsylvania 18201  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Thomas S. Clark  
Roy Jorgensen Associates, Inc.  
P.O. Box 70  
Buckeystown, Maryland 21717-0070  
(w/o enclosures)